

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON  
EUGENE DIVISION

MARTIN RODRIGUEZ;  
BRITNI RODRIGUEZ,

Civ. No. 6:23-cv-01863-MK

Plaintiffs,

**OPINION & ORDER**

v.

SALEM POLICE DEPARTMENT;  
MARION COUNTY SHERIFF'S  
DEPARTMENT; MARION COUNTY  
JUSTICE COURT; MARION COUNTY;  
CITY OF SALEM,

Defendants.

---

AIKEN, District Judge.

This case comes before the Court on Plaintiffs' "Response," ECF No. 82, to the Court's denial of their motion for a TRO, ECF No. 80. The Court interprets this filing as a motion for reconsideration of the Court's Order. So construed, the motion is DENIED.

Reconsideration is "an extraordinary remedy to be used sparingly in the interests of finality and conservation of judicial resources." *Carroll v. Nakatani*, 342 F.3d 934, 945 (9th Cir. 2003). "Motions for reconsideration are not the proper vehicles for rehashing old arguments and not intended to give an unhappy litigant on additional chance to sway the judge." *Hernandez v. Jefferson Cnty. Sheriff's Office*,

Case No. 3:19-cv-1404-JR, 2021 WL 2349320, at \*1 (D. Or. Feb. 1, 2021) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted, alterations normalized). In addition, a motion for reconsideration “may not be used to raise arguments or present evidence for the first time when they could reasonably have been raised earlier in the litigation.” *Carroll*, 342 F.3d at 945.

The Court has reviewed the record and given due consideration to Plaintiffs’ arguments and finds no cause to revise its earlier ruling. Plaintiffs’ Response, ECF No. 82, which the Court interprets as a motion for reconsideration is DENIED.

It is so ORDERED and DATED this 27th day of June 2024.

/s/Ann Aiken

ANN AIKEN

United States District Judge